COLORADO RIVER RECOVERY PROGRAM FY 2007 ANNUAL REPORT

RECOVERY PROGRAM PROJECT NUMBER <u>124</u>

- I. Project Title: Duchesne River Riffle Habitat Measurements
- II. Principal Investigators:

Sam Finney U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1380 South 2350 West Vernal, UT 84078 Office (435) 789-0351 Fax (435) 789-4805

Email: sam_finney@fws.gov

Jay Groves Northern Ute Tribe P. O. Box 190 Duchesne, UT 84026 Office (435) 725-4816 Email: jayg@utetribe.com

III. Project Summary:

Recent base flow recommendations (Haines and Modde 2003) identified passage needs for endangered fish in the Duchesne River. The goal of these recommendations was to establish Colorado pikeminnow usage of the Duchesne River at historical numbers. Flows are needed to provide ample water for passage, productivity, and habitat requirements of Colorado pikeminnow. Haines and Modde (2003) showed a discharge of 115 CFS preserves most riffle habitat and provides fish passage. Base flow model predictions (noted in the Haines and Modde report as imprecise extrapolations) were ground truthed in 2006 (Finney 2006). The report noted, however, that the hydraulic control was not always the shallowest point in the riffle. The objective of this project is to measure wetted widths and depths (including max depth) at various cross sections within the seven riffles measured in 2006 and compare these from a Colorado pikeminnow passage standpoint.

IV. Study Schedule

a. Initial year: FY07b. Final year: FY07

V. Relationship to RIPRAP

Green River Action Plan: Duchesne River

I.G. Evaluate and revise as needed, flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations

VI. Accomplishments of FY07 Tasks and Deliverables, Discussion of Initial Findings and Shortcomings.

River profile data were taken at the seven locations sampled by Finney (2006) by measuring wetted width and four depths along the wetted width axis (including finding max depth; Table 1). Our "weakest link" theory states that passage depth required, in this case 30cm, is only valid if that depth is available throughout the riffle and not just at the hydraulic control point. This being

the case, passage (30cm), at the flows during our sampling, would only be available at river profile #7 (the furthest downstream; Table 2). Considering measurements were taken at >80CFS this is contrary to passage flow requirements identified in Haines and Modde (2003) and Finney (2006).

VII. Recommendation

- 1. Continue to investigate relationships of flow and fish passage in riffle habitats.
- 2. Coordinate results of USGS Duchesne River Sediment study (Project 8b field work concludes in Spring /Summer 2008; reporting in fall 2008); Project 124; and recent fishery investigations to determine an appropriate strategy to evaluate the Duchesne River Flow Recommendations.
- VIII. **Project Status**

Complete

IX. FY07 Budget Status

		<u>Total</u>
A. Funds Provided:		\$2,597
B. Funds Expended:		\$2,597
C. Difference:		0
D. Recovery Program Funds for Publications:	0	

X. Status of Data Transmission

> Data is being entered and will be submitted to the program data base manager upon the completion of the study.

XI. Signed: Sam Finney 10/28/2007 Principal Investigator Date

Literature Cited

Finney, S. T. 2006. Nonnative Fish Removal, Fish Community Structure, and Riffle Habitat Measurements in the Duchesne River. RIP Annual Report Meeting. Vernal, Utah.

Haines, G. B., and T. M. Modde. 2003. Base flow needs for endangered fish in the Duchesne River. Final Report for the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin. UCRBRIP Project No. 84-5, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado.

Table 1. Discharge for thalweg depth of 0.3m, Duchesne River 2006 (from Finney 2006) and measured maximum depths and discharge (Randlett Guage) at the same riffles in 2007.

Cross Section (2006)	Discharge (2006)	Maximum Depth (2007)	Discharge (2007)
1	6	49	85
2	28	20	80
3	25	48	80
4	29	44	80
5	>300	18	80
6	40	38	80
7	30	38	80

Table 2. Cross sectional depths measured, including max depth (in red) at the seven cross sections measured in 2007.

Profile		Wet Wid.	Surf Dept	Surf Dept	Surf Dept	Surf Dept	050
#	Date	(m)	(cm)	(cm)	(cm)	(cm)	CFS
1	8/27/2007	23.59	14	12	23	26	85
1	8/27/2007	18.37	33	37	49	47	85
1	8/27/2007	22.68	40	43	38	26	85
1	8/27/2007	31.04	49	45	30	24	85
2	9/25/2007	57.14	14	13	15	17	80
2	9/25/2007	57.14	15	15	14	15	80
2	9/25/2007	57.14	13	15	17	14	80
2	9/25/2007	57.14	12	12	20	13	80
3	9/25/2007	40.02	26	34	48	39	80
3	9/25/2007	40.57	17	22	26	24	80
3	9/25/2007	35.14	31	29	40	25	80
3	9/25/2007	27.59	28	19	21	29	80
4	9/25/2007	58.46	32	16	18	28	80
4	9/25/2007	10.30	20	26	18	10	80
4	9/25/2007	13.18	20	38	36	44	80
4	9/25/2007	19.14	36	36	24	18	80
5	9/25/2007	70.99	10	10	11	5	80
5	9/25/2007	70.99	12	14	16	9	80
5	9/25/2007	70.99	18	16	6	14	80
5	9/25/2007	70.99	5	13	9	16	80
6	9/25/2007	55.40	29	33	36	38	80
6	9/25/2007	55.08	10	20	28	20	80
6	9/25/2007	42.73	27	32	29	21	80
6	9/25/2007	35.32	10	17	20	24	80
7	9/25/2007	34.10	35	29	36	32	80
7	9/25/2007	26.1	29	32	38	34	80
7	9/25/2007	19.00	35	24	27	27	80
7	9/25/2007	19.17	28	38	32	26	80